

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Regarding the rejection of drawings as not identifying element 450 in Fig. 4a, applicants submit new Figure 4a, identifying element. Reference to element 450 appears in the specification at p. 7, line 9.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 to 20 are pending. Claims 1-3 and 5-20 are currently rejected. Claim 4 is objected to. Claims 1 and 10 are currently amended to add the limitation of claim 4. Claims 2, 3, and 4 are hereby cancelled. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

**OBJECTIONS****Claims**

Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to add the limitation of claim 4.

**Specification**

The disclosure is objected to for the following formalities:

- a. on page 5 the serial number of the referenced copending application is missing
- b. page 7, line 09 refers to a “line 450” that is not shown in Figures 4a-4e
- c. page 11, line 12 refers to non-existent Figure 3d

Applicant submits that the disclosure and drawings are suitable as amended and reconsideration of the objection is requested.

**§ 102 REJECTIONS**

Claims 1, 5, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Heller et al. (WO98/35225).

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited reference will not support a 102(b) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McAleer et al. (U.S. 5,708,247).

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection. Applicant has cancelled claim 2.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited reference will not support a 102(b) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 5, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang et al. (U.S. 6,923,894).

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited reference will not support a 102(b) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 5, 10, 11, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nozoe et al. (U.S. 5,741,634).

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection. Applicant has cancelled claims 2 and 3.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited reference will not support a 102(b) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Say et al. (U.S. 6,175,752).

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited reference will not support a 102(b) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

### **§ 103 REJECTIONS**

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAleer et al. (U.S. 5,708,247) in view of Karinka et al. (U.S. 6,939,450).

Applicant has cancelled claim 3.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAleer et al. (U.S. 5,708,247) in view of Bhullar et al. (U.S. 6,488,828).

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited references will not support a 103(a) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (U.S. 6,923,894) in view of CAPLUS abstract and Figure 2 of Moeller (DE 10020445).

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited reference will not support a 103(a) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heller et al. (WO98/35225).

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited reference will not support a 103(a) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAleer et al. (U.S. 5,708,247).

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited reference will not support a 103(a) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (U.S. 6,923,894).

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited reference will not support a 103(a) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heller et al. (WO98/35225) in view of the JPO English language machine translation of Mariko et al. (JP2000-019146) and Charlton et al. (U.S. 5,759,364).

Applicant has amended claim 10 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited references will not support a 103(a) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (U.S. 6,923,894) in view of the JPO English language machine translation of Mariko et al. (JP2000-019146).

Applicant has amended claim 10 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited references will not support a 103(a) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (U.S. 6,923,894) in view of the JPO English language machine translation of Mariko et al. (JP2000-019146) as applied to claims 10-17 above, and further in view of Heller et al. (WO98/35225).

Applicant has amended claim 10 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited references will not support a 103(a) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heller et al. (WO98/35225) in view of Ou-Yang et al. (US2003/0204313).

Applicant has amended claim 10 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited references will not support a 103(a) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAleer et al. (U.S. 5,708,247) in view of Ou-Yang et al. (US2003-0204313).

Applicant has amended claim 10 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited references will not support a 103(a) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (U.S. 6,923,894) in view of Ou-Yang et al. (US2003/0204313).

Applicant has amended claim 10 to include the limitation of claim 4 thereby overcoming the rejection.

For this reason, Applicant submits that the cited references will not support a 103(a) rejection of the amended claims and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition to the foregoing arguments, Applicant submits that a dependent claim should be considered allowable when its parent claim is allowed. *In re McCarn*, 101 USPQ 411 (CCPA 1954). Accordingly, provided the independent claims are allowed, all claims depending therefrom should also be allowed.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 is requested. Examination and reconsideration of the claims are requested. Allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney if the Examiner believes any remaining questions or issues could be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

October 16, 2007  
Date

By: Melanie Gover  
Melanie G. Gover, Reg. No.: 41,793  
Telephone No.: 512-984-4308

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833